DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 538 UD 024 938

AUTHOR Slaughter, Diana T.; And Others
TITLE Children's Peer Acceptance and Parental Involvement in Desegregated Private Elementary Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Students; Elementary Education; *Family Involvement; Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; *Peer Acceptance; Private Schools; *Racial Differences; School Desegregation; *Social Development; Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

As part of a larger study which investigated the educational aims of black parents who send their children to private desegregated schools, a survey was taken to examine the relationship between parental involvement and students' peer acceptance. "Parental involvement," knowing how to obtain the information necessary to support the child's schooling, was distinguished from "parental participation," direct engagement in school activities. The study sample consisted of 63 black and white children (Grades 4-8) and their parents, representing four different schools. Data were derived from parent interviews and child questionnaires, and such factors as family income and mother's education were used as measures of family background. The study found that parental involvement is an important predictor, both positively and negatively, of black children's peer acceptance in schools, even when typical predictors are controlled. Within this essentially middle-income group, the black children and their non-black friends revealed different predictors of peer acceptance on two acceptance measures used (Peer Study With and Peer Be With), but not on a third (Peer Can Influence). Black students whose parents are most likely to be personally involved in school committees, groups, and activities are least likely to be chosen as friends other students preferred to be with. These results point to the need for more studies which explore the implications of family-school relations for children's social development. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diana Slaughter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED270538

Children's Peer Acceptance and Parental Involvement in Desegregated Private Elementary Schools

Diana T. Slaughter
Northwestern University

Barbara L. Schneider
Northwestern University

Joanne Gold
University of Chicago

Deborah J. Johnson
Northwestern University

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA., April 16-20, 1986

UD024938

Abstract

Parental involvement of middle-income parents (Ns = 61-63) is found to be an important positive and negative predictor of middle school aged children's peer acceptance. Parental involvement relates to being chosen as someone to study with, and especially, to be with, but not to being chosen as someone who can be influential. In the current literature, parental involvement in schools has been primarily related to children's academic achievements. This study suggests that a child's social supports in school are also tied to aspects of parental involvement, and points to a need for studies which explore a range of family-school relations as to implications for children's social development.

Children's Peer Acceptance and Parental Involvement in Desegregated Private Elementary Schools

Peer acceptance, according to Hartup (1983), refers to the extent to which (a) a child is sought by others for associative contact (popularity or likeability), and (b) a child is thought to be a worthy or valuable member of a group (status or standing). Early studies of the determinants of peer acceptance among children have stressed the children's social background characteristics (e.g., Neugarten, 1944, Koch, 1946) and personal attributes (e.g., Koch, 1933; Bonney, 1943). The use of self-reported preference choices to study peer acceptance is a tradition in the research (Hartup, 1970; Hallinan, 1981; Renshaw, 1981). Individual difference characteristics such as sex, race, age and grade level, intelligence (I.Q.) and achievement performance, physical attractiveness, self esteem, friendliness, and social assertiveness have been found to be correlates of peer acceptance (Hartup, 1970, 1979, 1983; Asher, 1983).

Parenting is an important influence upon children's peer relations. Children of secure, warm and loving parents who hold reasonable standards and offer consistent discipline enjoy more successful peer relations (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Hartup, 1983; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Beyond family, the social organization of settings in which children are found, for example, schools and classrooms, is stressed in studies of children's peer relations

(e.g., Epstein & Kuweit, 1983; St. John & Lewis, 1975; Miller, 1983; Schofield, 1981).

Few studies have directly investigated the relationship between parental involvement in schools and children's peer acceptance (Leler, 1983). Two reviews (Epps & Smith, 1984; Minuchin & Sharpiro, 1983) indicate studies stress parental involvement relative to student achievement and academic self concept (e.g., Comer, 1980; Epstein & Becker, 1982) rather than social competence and peer acceptance.

Parental involvement and children's peer status in schools could be related for at least three reasons. First, children who adapt successfully to school peer relations are likely to have first developed and practiced, within the context of their families, the necessary social skills. Isherwood and Hammah (1981) report that among Canadian high schoolers, a youth's school attitudes are predicted by measures of the extent to which family members are used as referents for discussions. Second, parents with social skills are also likely to use them in extrafamilial settings involving their children. Schools may perceive the children of families who are more persistently involved in school activities more favorably because of favorable attitudes toward the parents. There is indication that a teacher's attitude toward a child's social background characteristics influences the attitudes of peers (e.g., Rist, 1970, 1978; Gerard, Jackson, & Conolley, 1975). Third, parents who are more involved with a school are more likely to be aware of what is required for the successful adaptation of their children in that school; they can better counsel and direct the child's school-related behaviors, including behaviors with school peers. This is a widely-held assumption of school-based

programs designed to encourage parental involvement (Clarke-Stewart, 1983; Olmstead & Rubin, 1983). For these reasons, it was expected that parental involvement in school would relate significantly to elementary school children's peer acceptance even when the effects of family background, child personality, and school racial composition are considered.

Method

Subjects

The study sample of 63 children, each from independent families, is drawn from a larger sample of 131 families, 74 black (B), 57 nonblack (NB). A focal child in each of the families attends a desegregated private elementary school in Chicago. Two schools are private elite, one is Catholic, and one began as an alternative independent preschool. Annual tuition across the four schools ranges from $750 to about $6000. The black children in the sample are no more likely to receive scholarship aid than other children.

The purposes of the larger study were to determine the educational aims of the black parents sending their children to the schools, and to describe the in-school experiences of the black children. Of special interest was the relationship between the families and the schools, and the consequences for the schooling experiences of the black children. Nonblack children who participated were nominated by teachers as especially friendly with one or more black children in the school. Data gathering methods included home-based interviews with parents, usually mothers. Child questionnaires were administered to entire classrooms by teachers (Slaughter & Schneider, 1986).

Only child subjects for whom complete data were available on all variables included in this study are used. Therefore, sample N's vary somewhat across the three dependent measures. The mean age of all child subgroups is 11.1 years, and SD's range from 1.30-1.14. Overall percentages of black enrollment at the four schools are: Alternative, 50% (N=126); Catholic, 35% (N=163); Elite II, 28% (N=331); Elite I, 6% (N=564). Of 63 total children, 16 attend School1 (Alternative), 21 attend School2 (Catholic), 24 attend School3 (Elite II), and 2 attend School4 (Elite I). Eight of the children from School1, 10 from School2, 12 from School3, and both children from School4, are black. The mean grade level of all child subgroups is 5.4, and SD's range from 1.14-1.06. Though sample children attend grades four to eight, most children are fifth graders (The numbers of available children at School4 are low for this study because the needed parental permission for child questionnaires was not obtained at the time of parent interviews. As a school type (i.e., private elite, college preparatory), School4 is very similar to School3.).

Measures

Family background. Two measures of family background are used in this study: Mother's education and Total 1982 Family Income. Maternal years of education has been significantly correlated with children's schooling behaviors and achievements in many studies. Within predominantly middle to upper-status communities, there are difficulties associated even with occupational prestige ratings of socioeconomic status (Gottfried, 1985; Mueller & Parcel, 1981). Family income was chosen over occupation as a measure of socioeconomic status within this urban group. Most study families have at least one professional member who works in either health

or education-related industries, and many have more than one.

Parental involvement. Parental involvement in schools should be distinguished from direct parental participation. Being aware of how to participate effectively, and of how to obtain the necessary information to support the child's schooling, may often be as important as active participation in school activities. Feeling a sense of loyalty or commitment to the child's school may also be as vital (Schneider & Slaughter, 1985). Parent involvement may be stimulated by schools, parents, or within a larger community context (Gordon, Olmstead, Rubin, & True, 1979; Leler, 1983).

A three-hour parent interview included a series of open and close-ended questions designed to assess parental involvement with school life. Questions were developed and piloted prior to the larger study, following informal interviews with school faculty and parents of students at other private elementary schools. Four measures of parent involvement were used in this study. First, responses to 10 questions were scored and raw scores weighted as to parental Awareness of opportunities to voluntarily participate in school committees, groups, and activities (Maximum = 11). Second, responses to two other questions were scored as to parental Awareness of feedback sources as to the child's academic progress (Maximum = 20). Parents were asked whether they used, for example, parent-teacher conferences, homework, test results, grades, etc. for feedback about the child's academic progress. Third, Parental Degree of personal involvement in school groups and activities (extent and time duration) was assessed from responses to 14 questions (Maximum = 37). Parents judged to have

a high degree of involvement reported more time and a greater scope of responsibility (e.g., President of a Parent's Club) in relation to school activities. Fourth, Parental faculty membership was assessed from responses to one question where "0" = Never, "1" = Formerly, but not now, and "2" = Yes, currently. A coding manual for obtained data has been developed (Ritts, Slaughter, & Schneider, 1984) which details scoring criteria and procedures for each rated variable. Many rated items do not require extensive inference; interjudge agreement on those that do is 78 percent or better. In these schools, a minimum level of parental participation is routinely expected of all parents. Therefore, any biases in self-reporting were assumed to be uniformly positive for all respondents.

Self concept. Harter's (1982) measures of perceived competence and self esteem were given to children (N=183). Scores on the six scales range from 1.00 (low)-4.00. In addition, each student was asked to rank itself academically in comparison with classmates on a 1(low)-5 point scale (Student Self Evaluation), where "1" = Near the bottom, "2" = Below the middle, "3" = In the middle, "4" = Above the middle, and "5" = One of the best. Finally, interviewed parents were asked to evaluate how confident their child is, in comparison with peers, using a 5-point scale where 1 = Not self-confident, 2 = Fairly self-confident, 3 = Self-confident, 4 = Very self-confident, and 5 = Extremely self-confident.

Peer acceptance. Using a procedure developed by Cohen-Esquilin (1979), each child was requested to give three names in response to three probes: Name three kids it likes to study with, to be with, and who can get it to do things. Responses were restricted

to children in its class or grade level. Each child's peer rank was the number of nominations over the class size or grade level. The score was multiplied by 100; inspection of frequency distributions resulted in reclassification of the data (N=226) into a six-point scale: 1 = No mention; 2 = Low mention; 3 = Average mention; 4 = Above average mention; 5 = Very high mention; and 6 = Highest mention. Children in the No mention category are not necessarily isolated children. They were not cited by the total group of responding children, in each instance representing a minimum of 33 percent of the class or grade (The two smaller schools combine grade levels in classes.).

A convergent-discriminant matrix (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) using data, including reading and mathematics achievement scores, from the entire sample of children (Ns = 226-156), supported the validity of the self concept and peer status measures (Slaughter & Schneider, 1986).

All parent interviews were conducted by same-race interviewers prior to observations in the 83-84 academic year; child questionnaires were administered and scored at the conclusion of that year. Since child questionnaires were administered to all available children in grades 4-8 (5-8 in the elite schools), children whose parents were interviewed were contrasted with children whose parents were not on the child measures used in this study. T-tests reveal no significant differences ($p > .05$), neither for all children, nor for black children.

Results

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of the predictor and criterion measures used in this study. The results

Insert Table 1 about here

are presented by peer status criterion measure for the three study groups: Total children, Black children, and Nonblack children.

Apart from the total sample, results are also presented in Table 1, as in Tables 2–4, by racial subgroup. The purpose of analyses by racial subgroup was not to determine whether race is a significant predictor of peer status, but whether the predictors of peer status differ between racial groups. For Peer Study With, there are 61 children, 34 males (M), 27 females (F). Seventeen of the 34M are black; 13 of the 27F are black. For Peer Be With, there are 61 children: 35M, 26F. Eighteen of the 35M are black; 13 of the 26F are black. For Peer Can Influence, there are 63 children, 35M, 28F. Eighteen of the 35M are black; 14 of the 28F are black.

Identical measures of parental involvement were entered as predictors of each criterion variable. The one exception was the use of Parental Faculty Membership for Peer Study With. Private schools often enroll the children of faculty; such children might have a peer advantage, as far as being preferred persons to study with. Other measures of parental involvement were chosen on theoretical grounds, using the study definition of parental involvement.

Pearson correlation matrices indicated that not all self concept measures would be useful predictors of each peer criterion measure. To be included as a potential predictor, a measure had to achieve significance in the larger sample of children at .05 (two-tailed) or better with a peer status measure. Using this

cutoff, Parental Assessment of Child Self Confidence and Child Self Esteem were not found to be useful entry predictors of Peer Study With. Student Academic Self Evaluation and Child Self Esteem were not found to be useful entry predictors of Peer Be With. Finally, Parental Assessment of Child Self Confidence, Child Social Competence, and Student Academic Self Evaluation, were not found to be useful entry predictors of Peer Can Influence.

In separate two-way analyses of variance (Slaughter & Schneider, 1986) significant main effects for school, but not race, were obtained for measures of peer status. Therefore, in this study the four schools were ranked from high (1) to low (4) on percent black enrollment, so that School could be included in the present linear analyses. Since each child had an assigned school, data in Table 1 simply suggest that for each criterion measure both subgroups, black and nonblack, had similar proportions of children from the same school.

Mothers in the sample averaged 15-16 years of educational attainment, about 3-4 years of college. Total 1982 yearly family income averaged $35,000-44,999 (category 5). Family incomes of two-thirds of the sample in each group ranged between $10,000-75,000.

In the stepwise analyses, the first variable considered for entry into the equation was always the one with the largest (positive or negative) correlation with the dependent or criterion variable. To determine whether this, and each succeeding, variable was entered, the F-Value was compared to FIN = 3.84, PIN = 0.05. The second variable was then selected based upon the highest partial correlation. However, in subsequent analyses, the results produced by each variable occasioned all variables, beginning with

the first, to be reexamined for possible removal (FOUT = 2.71, POUT = 0.10) from the total equation. The stepwise procedure ended when no further predictor variables met entry and removal criteria. Though clusters of variables were entered, variables were not ordered or modelled in advance of this stepwise procedure.

Table 2 presents data on the first three of nine stepwise multiple linear regressions. In Table 2, the criterion measure is

---

Insert Table 2 about here

Peer Study With. Results are presented first for all children, then for the black and nonblack child subgroups. Beta coefficients indicate that in the total sample a moderate, but definite, linear relationship exists between Child Social Competence, Parental Faculty Membership, School, Student Academic Self Evaluation, and Peer Study With. The number of a child's peer nominations, as someone others prefer to study with, can be best predicted by knowing something of how socially skilled the child perceives itself to be, as well as how good a student, whether the child's parent is now, or has been, part of the school staff or faculty, and the percentage of black students in the school. In this case, being the child of a staff or faculty member is a disadvantage. The obtained significance levels on the t-statistics further support the hypothesis that Peer Study With and these ecological and personal-social variables are linearly related. Approximately 36 percent of the variance in obtained peer status is accounted for by these predictor variables.

Within race stepwise analyses were performed using the same predictor variables. For black children, the single useful

predictor is Child Social Competence; for nonblack children it is School. In this sample, knowing how socially competent a black child perceives itself to be is predictive of the child's peer status as a person prefered to study with, while knowing the school attended is predictive of the nonblack child's peer status.

Table 3 presents data on three additional stepwise multiple

Insert Table 3 about here

---

linear regressions, this time using Peer Be With as the criterion variable. Results are presented for all children, then for the black and nonblack child subgroups. Beta coefficients indicate that in the total sample a significant moderate linear relationship exists between Child Social Competence, School, Mother's Education, Parental Awareness of Sources of Feedback on Child's Academic Progress, and Peer Be With. The number of a child's peer nominations, as someone others prefer to be with, can be best predicted by knowing how socially skilled the child perceives itself to be, the percentage of black students in the school, the amount of education obtained by its mother, and the parents' awareness of a variety of informational sources of feedback about the child's academic progress. In this total sample, children of parents least well-educated, relatively speaking, are more likely to be chosen as persons preferred to be with. T-statistics further support the hypothesis of a linear relationship between predictor and criterion variables. About 33 percent of the variance in peer acceptance scores is accounted for by measures of these predictor variables.

Separate stepwise analyses reveal results differ for black and

nonblack children. For black children, Child Social Competence, School, and Parental Awareness of Sources of Feedback are important, but also Degree of Parent Involvement in School (Activities). Children of black parents most involved in school life are least likely to be chosen as someone preferred to be with. For nonblack children, Child Social Competence and School are important, but also Parental Assessment of the Child's Self Confidence, and the Mother's Education. Children of nonblack parents who are the most highly educated, relatively speaking, and who perceive them to be the most self-confident, are least likely to be chosen. In this sample, parental involvement variables seem especially important to a black child's peer status as someone others prefer to be with.

Table 4 presents data on the final three stepwise regressions.

Insert Table 4 about here

In Table 4 the criterion measure is Peer Can Influence. The same predictor is significant for all children, as well as the black and nonblack child subgroups: School. Beta coefficients indicate a moderately strong significant linear relationship between School and Peer Can Influence. The number of a child's peer nominations, as someone whom others perceive as influential, is best predicted by the school's percentage of black students. In this sample, children who attend schools with lower percentages of black students are less likely to be chosen as someone who is influential. Results are strongest for nonblack, in comparison with black, students, though p-values on obtained t-statistics for all three groups suggest the hypothesis of a linear relationship

between School and Peer Can Influence. In the total sample, scores on School account for approximately 29 percent of the variance in peer status scores; however among nonblacks, School scores account for approximately 39 percent of the variance in peer status scores.

In summary, Total Family Income is not a significant predictor of any criterion measure. Parental Awareness of Opportunities to Participate in School is also not a significant predictor. Parental Faculty Membership is a useful predictor of Peer Study With, while Awareness of Sources of Feedback on Child's Academic Progress is a significant predictor of Peer Be With. Measures of parental involvement seem more predictive of black, in comparison with nonblack, children's peer status. Self concept measures, especially Child Social Competence, are also important predictors of Peer Study With and Peer Be With. Neither parental involvement measures nor self concept measures are useful predictors of Peer Can Influence: the sole significant predictor is School. Mother's Education, Degree of Parental Involvement in School (blacks only), and Parental Assessment of the Child's Self Confidence (nonblacks only) are inversely predictive of peer nominations of a child as someone preferred to be with.

Discussion

Results generally support the hypothesis that parental involvement in schools and peer acceptance are significantly related. The study supports literature which stresses important ties between family and children's peer relations (Hartup, 1983; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Results also suggest the ties are anything but simple.

Parental involvement is itself a multi-dimensional variable;

some dimensions are found to be more salient for peer acceptance than others. In these schools, children of faculty members are least likely to be chosen as a preferred study mate. Perhaps other children perceive them more competitively, or perhaps these children demonstrate less of a need for study companions. Black students whose parents are most likely to be personally involved in school committees, groups, and activities are least likely to be chosen as someone preferred to be with. Possibly, these early adolescents prefer more distance from parents, but it is also possible that the parents participate more actively because of perceptions that their children need their presence. Direct parental participation in schools is not necessarily beneficial for all children, nor for all aspects of an early adolescent's peer relations.

Other findings support previously cited researches which stress the importance of self concept and school social organization for children's peer relations. School is an important predictor of all three measures of peer acceptance. In this study, school racial composition varies directly with school size. In substantially desegregated settings, children must typically receive peer nominations from cross-race peers to attain high levels of peer acceptance. Others (e.g., Miller, 1983; Schofield, 1981) have suggested that the likelihood of cross-racial nominations is strengthened in school settings where peers have more opportunities for cooperative, face-to-face interactions. Smaller desegregated schools may attenuate the early adolescent tendency to show increasingly same-race preferences.

Children's social competence is predictive of peer acceptance, a finding supportive of the theories of other researchers (e.g.,

Rubin, 1983; Asher, 1983). However, the peer popularity of nonblack children is somewhat less if parents perceive the child to be especially self-confident. Hartup and others have reported that child peers often are less accepting of overly-confident children. Evidence suggests the children have criteria for peer success that are independent of parental judgements.

Even within this essentially middle-income group, the black children and their nonblack friends reveal different predictors of peer acceptance on two of the three acceptance measures: Peer Study With and Peer Be With. For black children, peer acceptance can be traced and linked to parental involvement. This aspect of the study begs replication because of the very special character of the black population: middle to upper-middle class blacks who have voluntarily chosen to send their children to a desegregated urban private elementary school.

In summary, parental involvement has been shown to be an important predictor, both positively and negatively, of black children's peer acceptance in schools, even when typical predictors are controlled. In the literature to date, parental involvement in schools has been primarily related to children's academic achievements. This study suggests that a child's social supports within the school are also tied to certain aspects of parental involvement. Studies to date have primarily focused on parental interventions with children who are lacking social skills (Asher, 1983). This approach offers too limited an understanding of the social context in which racial and ethnic minority children and their families participate in predominantly white schools. These children are more likely to be socially accepted by peers

when their parents are knowledgeable about the school as a social institution.

References

Asher, S. (1983). Social competence and peer status: Recent advances and future directions. Child Development, 54, 1427-1434.

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38, 291-327.

Bonney, M. (1943). Personality traits of socially successful and socially unsuccessful children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 34, 449-472.

Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.

Clarke-Stewart, K. (1983). Exploring the assumptions of parent education. In R. Haskins & D. Adams (Eds.), Parent education and public policy (pp. 257-276). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cohen-Esquilin, S. (1979). Social cognition and children's peer status. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Comer, J. (1980). School power. New York: Free Press.

Epps, E., & Smith, S. (1984). School and children: The middle childhood years. In A. Collins (Ed.), Development during middle childhood (pp. 283-334). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Epstein, J., & Karweit, N. (Eds.) (1983). Friends in school: Patterns of selection and influence in secondary schools. New York: Academic Press.

Epstein, J., & Becker, H. (1982). Teachers' reported practices of

parent involvement: Problems and possibilities. Elementary School Journal, 83, 103-113.

Gerard, H., Jackson, T., & Conolley, E. (1975). Social contact in the desegregated classroom. In H. Gerard & N. Miller (Eds.), School desegregation. New York: Plenum Press.

Gordon, I., Olmsted, P., Rubin, R., & True, J. (1979). How has Follow-Through promoted parent involvement? Young Children, 34(5), 49-53.

Gottfried, A. (1985). Measures of socioeconomic status in child development research: data and recommendations. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 31(1), 85-92.

Hallinan, M. (1976). Friendship patterns in open and traditional classrooms. Sociology of Friendship, 49, 254-264.

Hallinan, M. (1981). Recent advances in sociometry. In. S. Asher & J. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships (pp. 91-115). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harter, S. (1982). The perceived competence scale for children. Child Development, 53(1), 87-97.

Hartup, W. (1979). Children and their friends. In H. McGurk (Ed.), Issues in childhood social development (pp. 130-170). London: Methuen Inc.

Hartup, W. (1970). Peer interaction and social organization. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology Vol. 3. New York: Wiley.

Hartup, W. (1983). Peer relations. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. E. Hetherington (Ed.), Socialization, personality, and social development. New York: Wiley.

Isherwood, G., & Hammah, C. (1981). Home and school factors and

the quality of school life in Canadian high schools. In J. Epstein (Ed.), The quality of school life (pp. 137-151). Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Koch, H. (1933). Popularity among preschool children: Some related factors and a technique for its measurement. Child Development, 4, 164-175.

Koch, H. (1946). The social distance between certain racial, nationality and skin-pigmentation groups in selected populations of American school children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 68, 63-95.

Leler, H. (1983). Parent education and involvement in relation to to the schools and to parents of school-aged children. In R. Haskins & D. Adams (Eds.), Parent education and public policy (pp. 141-180). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. E. Hetherington (Ed.), Socialization, personality, and social development. New York: Wiley.

Miller, N. (1983). Peer relations in desegregated schools. In J. Epstein, & N. Karweit (Eds.), Friends in school: Patterns of selection and influence in secondary schools (pp. 201-218). New York: Academic Press.

Minuchin, P., & Sharpiro, E. (1983). The school as a context for social development. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. E. Hetherington (Ed.), Socialization, personality, and social development. New York: Wiley.

Mueller, C., & Parcel, T. (1981). Measures of socioeconomic

status: Alternatives and recommendations. Child Development, 52, 13-30.

Neugarten, B. (1944). Social class and friendship among school children. American Journal of Sociology, 49, 305-313.

Olmsted, P., & Rubin, R. Parent involvement: Perspectives from the Follow Through experience. In R. Haskins & D. Adams (Eds.), Parent education and public policy (pp. 112-140). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Renshaw, P. (1981). The roots of current peer interaction research: a historical analysis of the 1930s. In S. Asher & J. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships (pp. 1-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rist, R. (1978). The invisible children: School integration in American society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rist, R. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 40, 411-451.

Ritts, K., Slaughter, D., & Schneider, B. (1984, May). Newcomers: Blacks in Private Schools - Parent Participation in the Schools: Coding Manual V. Unpublished manuscript.

Rubin, K. (1983). Recent perspectives on social competence and peer status: Some introductory remarks. Child Development, 54, 1383-1385.

Schneider, B., & Slaughter, D. (1985, April). Parents and school life: Varieties of parent participation in differing types of private schools. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Schofield, J. (1981). Complementary and conflicting identities: images and interaction in an interracial school. In S. Asher

& J. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships (pp. 53-90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slaughter, D., & Schneider, B. (1986). Newcomers: Blacks in Private Schools. Final Report to the National Institute of Education, NIE-G-82-0040, Project No. 2-0450.

St. John, N., & Lewis, R. (1975). Race and the social structure of the elementary classroom. Sociology of Education, 48, 346-368.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of
Predictor and Criterion Measures
of Peer Status

Groups[a]		Peer Study With			Peer Be With			Peer Can Influence		
		T (n=61)	B (n=30)	NB (n=31)	T (n=61)	B (n=31)	NB (n=30)	T (n=63)	B (n=32)	NB (n=31)
Predictor Measures										
School[b]	Mean	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.1
	SD	.83	.86	.80	.87	.92	.82	.86	.96	.85
Years of School Completed -- Mother		15.8	16.2	15.4	15.8	16.3	15.4	15.8	16.2	15.4
		3.34	3.06	3.60	3.34	3.00	3.66	3.30	2.98	3.60
Total Family Income		5.2	5.1	5.4	5.2	5.0	5.5	5.2	5.0	5.4
		3.07	2.84	3.31	3.05	2.82	3.31	3.03	2.78	3.31
Parental Awareness of Opportunities for School Participation		6.2	6.0	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.2	6.4
		2.73	2.82	2.65	2.57	2.85	2.30	2.76	2.89	2.66
Parental Awareness of Sources of Feedback on Child's Academic Progress		8.1	8.1	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.1	8.1	8.2
		1.88	1.92	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.91	1.86	1.86	1.88
Degree of Parental Involvement in School		11.4	10.8	11.9	11.3	11.1	11.5	11.5	11.1	11.9
		5.24	5.21	5.30	5.11	5.33	4.97	5.24	5.24	5.30
Parental Faculty Membership		.07	.03	.10	--	--	--	--	--	--
		.31	.18	.40	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 1 Continued

Groups		Peer Study With			Peer Be With			Peer Can Influence		
		T (n=61)	B (n=30)	NB (n=31)	T (n=61)	B (n=31)	NB (n=30)	T (n=63)	B (n=32)	NB (n=31)
Predictor Measures										
Parental Assessment of Child Self Confidence	Mean	--	--	--	3.3	3.5	3.1	--	--	--
	SD	--	--	--	1.26	1.12	1.38	--	--	--
Social Competence - Child Evaluation		3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.9	--	--	--
		.63	.68	.58	.64	.70	.57	--	--	--
Student Academic Self Evaluation		3.8	3.7	3.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
		.97	.98	.96	--	--	--	--	--	--
Self Esteem - Child Evaluation		--	--	--	--	--	--	3.0	3.0	3.0
		--	--	--	--	--	--	.64	.62	.68
Criterion Measures										
Peer Study With	Mean	3.4	3.4	3.4						
	SD	1.52	1.63	1.43						
Peer Be With					3.3	3.1	3.5			
					1.56	1.68	1.43			
Peer Can Influence								3.2	3.0	3.4
								1.70	1.75	1.65

[a] T=Total; B=Blacks; NB=Nonblacks

[b] The four study schools are ranked from high (1) to low (4) on percent black enrollment.

Table 2

Multiple Regressions Predicting Peer Status:
Who You Like to Study With

Predictors	Beta	t	p	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F (df)
Results for Total Group							
Social Competence	.32	2.93	.004	.63	.40	.36	9.26*** (4,56)
Parental Faculty Membership	-.22	-2.11	.039				
School	-.35	-3.36	.001				
Student Academic Self Evaluation	.24	2.26	.028				
Results for Black Students							
Social Competence	.63	4.24	.0002	.63	.39	.37	17.98** (1,28)
Results for Nonblack Students							
School	-.54	-3.45	.001	.54	.29	.27	11.90* (1,29)

* $p < .001$
** $p < .0002$
*** $p = .0000$

Table 3

Multiple Regressions Predicting Peer Status:
Who You Like to Be With

Predictors	Beta	t	p	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F (df)
Results for Total Group							
Social Competence	.29	2.72	.008	.61	.38	.33	8.43*** (4,56)
School	-.34	-3.06	.003				
Years of School Completed-Mother	-.25	-2.25	.028				
Aware of Child's Progress	.29	2.52	.014				
Results for Black Students							
Social Competence	.29	1.74	.093	.67	.45	.36	5.25** (4,26)
School	-.41	-2.74	.010				
Aware of Child's Progress	.35	2.07	.048				
Degree of Involvement in the School	-.31	-1.79	.085				
Results for Nonblack Students							
Social Competence	.47	2.89	.007	.63	.40	.30	4.13* (4,25)
Parent Assessment Child's Self Confidence	-.30	-1.93	.064				
School	-.46	-2.83	.009				
Years of School Completed-Mother	-.29	-1.77	.089				

* $p < .01$
** $p < .003$
*** $p = .0000$

Table 4

Multiple Regression Predicting Peer Status:
Who Can Influence You

Predictors	Beta	t	p	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F (df)
Results for Total Group							
School	-.55	-5.13	.0000	.55	.30	.29	26.35*** (1,61)
Results for Black Students							
School	-.47	-2.90	.006	.47	.22	.19	8.41* (1,30)
Results for Nonblack Students							
School	-.64	-4.54	.0001	.64	.41	.39	20.57** (1,29)

* $p < .009$
** $p = .0001$
*** $p = .0000$